

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-23 were pending in the application.

Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-23 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended as shown above. The Applicants submit that the amendments are supported at least by paragraphs [0057]-[0059] of the Specification.

Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-23 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. The Applicants make the amendments above and the arguments below to place this application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, the applicants make these amendments and offer these arguments to properly frame the issues for appeal.

CLAIM REJECTION – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0231625 to *Calvignac et al.* (“Calvignac”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,415,540 to *Fallon et al.* (“Fallon”) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0104286 to *Cheriton* (“Cheriton”). Claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 20, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac and Fallon in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,197,035 to *Asano* (“Asano”). Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac and Fallon in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0100956 to *Watanabe* (“Watanabe”). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of

establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142, p. 2100-133 (8th ed. rev. 4, October 2005). Absent such a *prima facie* case, the applicants are under no obligation to produce evidence of nonobviousness. *Id.* To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: *Id.* First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *Id.* Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.* The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success cannot be based on applicants' disclosure. *Id.*

Amended independent Claim 1 recites a router that includes a switch fabric and a plurality of routing nodes. Each routing node includes first and second network processors that include respective first and second pluralities of microengines. Each of the first and second pluralities of microengines are for performing respective first and second security and classification functions associated with data packets, where each data packet is distributed to a selected microengine. The first network processor receives data packets from external devices and transmits data packets to the switch fabric. The second network processor receives data packets from the switch fabric and transmits data packets to the external devices. Each routing node also has a routing table search circuit that includes an initial content addressable memory stage followed by a plurality of trie tree search table stages. One of the first and second security and classification functions is performed according to information from the routing table search circuit. The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not describe such a router.

The Examiner asserts that Calvignac and Fallon describe a router as recited in Claim 1 but acknowledges that Calvignac and Fallon do not describe a router where each of the router nodes includes a routing table search circuit comprising an initial content addressable memory stage followed by a plurality of trie tree search table stages. The Examiner asserts that Cheriton describes a routing table search circuit comprising an initial content addressable memory stage followed by a plurality of trie tree search table stages. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the cited references, taken alone or in any combination, do not describe the router recited in amended independent Claim 1, where one of the first and second security and classification functions is performed according to information from the routing table search circuit.

For at least these reasons, the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the unique and novel elements recited in independent Claim 1. Independent Claims 10 and 19 recite elements that are analogous to the unique and novel elements cited in Claim 1 and are also patentable over the cited references. Additionally, dependent Claims 2-7, 11-16, and 20-23 depend from the independent Claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively, and contain all of the unique and novel elements recited in Claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively. These dependent claims are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejection with respect to these claims.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that the remaining claims in the application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

If any issues arise or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *ddoyle@munckcarter.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK CARTER, LLP

Date: July 14, 2009

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *ddoyle@munckcarter.com*


David M. Doyle
Registration No. 46,596